arXiv:1510.03482v1 [cs.CC] 12 Oct 2015

Graph Editing Problems with Extended Regularity Constraints

Luke Mathieson

Centre for Information Based Medicine, Bioinformatics and Biomarker Discovery, University of Newcastle, Australia

Abstract

Graph editing problems offer an interesting perspective on sub- and supergraph identification problems for a large variety of target properties. They have also attracted significant attention in recent years, particularly in the area of parameterized complexity as the problems have rich parameter ecologies.

In this paper we examine generalisations of the notion of editing a graph to obtain a regular subgraph. In particular we extend the notion of regularity to include two variants of edge-regularity along with the unifying constraint of strong regularity. We present a number of results, with the central observation that these problems retain the general complexity profile of their regularity-based inspiration: when the number of edits k and the maximum degree r are taken together as a combined parameter, the problems are tractable (i.e. in FPT), but are otherwise intractable.

We also examine variants of the basic editing to obtain a regular subgraph problem from the perspective of parameterizing by the treewidth of the input graph. In this case the treewidth of the input graph essentially becomes a limiting parameter on the natural $k + r$ parameterization.

Keywords: graph algorithms, computational complexity, algorithms, parameterized complexity, graph editing

1. Introduction

Graph editing problems — problems where *editing operations* are applied to an input graph to obtain a graph with a given property — provide an interesting and flexible framework for considering many graph problems. For

example virtually any problem whose witness structure is a subset of the vertices of the input graph can be alternatively phrased as a problem regarding the deletion of vertices to obtain a suitable property. k-Vertex Cover can be viewed as the problem of deleting at most k vertices such that the resultant graph has no edges. This target property can be viewed as a *degree contraint*; the degree of all vertices in the final graph should be zero. The nature of the resulting graph can also be defined by which editing operations are allowed; vertex deletion alone results in induced subgraphs, edge deletion alone produces spanning subgraphs, and so on.

Degree contraint editing problems have long been of interest to comuputational complexity theorists and this interest has been echoed in the parameterized complexity context. The proof of the NP-completeness of Cubic Subgraph was attributed to Chvátal by Garey and Johnson [13]. This naturally generalises to r-Regular Subgraph, which we can consider as the problem of removing vertices and edges to obtain an r-regular graph. r-Regular Subgraph is NP-complete [27] for $r \geq 3$, even under a number input constraints [5, 30, 31, 32]. The problem of finding a maximum *induced* r-regular subgraph is NP-complete for $r \geq 0$ [4] ($r = 0$ is Maximum Independent Set and the removed vertices form a minimum vertex cover). If we allow only edge deletion, we have the r-Factor problem. For $r = 1$ this is the basic matching problem, well known to be polynomial [8, 9, 18, 19]. If $r > 1$, or indeed if each vertex has a different target degree (the f-Factor problem), Tutte gives a reduction a polynomial-time solvable matching problem [34, 35]. This problem can be further generalised by giving each vertex a range of target degrees (the Degree Constrained Subgraph problem) and is polynomial-time solvable [36]. If the edges of the graph have capacities (the (Perfect) b-Matching problem), the problem remains in P, using Tutte's f-Factor algorithm [17]. In the General Factor [20, 21] problem allows each vertex to have a list of target degrees. If the lists contain gaps of greater than 1, the problem is NP-complete and polynomial-time solvable otherwise [6]. The problem of adding at most 2 vertices and a minimum number of edges to obtain a Δ-regular supergraph, where Δ is the maximum degree of the input graph, is polynomial-time solvable [2].

In the parameterized complexity setting, deleting k vertices to obtain an r regular graph is W[1]-hard for $r \geq 0$ with parameter k [23], but FPT with parameter $k + r$ [24]. Mathieson and Szeider [23] give a series of results for similar problems, which is extended further in Mathieson's doctoral thesis [22]. In this they examine the Weighted Degree Constrained

EDITING (WDCE) problem where the vertices and edges are weighted and each vertex has a set of target degrees, for combinations of vertex deletion, edge deletion and edge addition. When parameterized by the number k of edits allowed, the problem is W[1]-hard, when parameterized by the number of edits and the maximum value r in any of the degree lists, the problem is FPT. When the target degree sets are singletons and the editing operations include only edge deletion and addition, the problem is in P. The problem remains W[1]-hard with parameter k even in the unweighted case where each vertex has the same target degree r. In the singleton case, where vertex deletion or vertex deletion and edge deletion is allowed, the problem has a kernel of size polynomial in $k + r$ (and hence is in FPT for parameter $k + r$). The more general WDCE problem with vertex deletion and/or edge deletion has a kernel of size exponential in $k + r$, and hence is FPT for parameter $k + r$. Froese *et al.* [12] prove that no polynomial kernel is possible in these cases unless NP $\subseteq$ coNP/*poly*. For the general weighted case with degree lists where the editing operations are any combination of vertex deletion, edge deletion and edge addition Mathieson and Szeider [23] give a logic based proof of FPT membership. Mathieson [22] shows that if vertex deletion and edge addition are allowed (and perhaps edge deletion), then in the weighted case (even with singleton vertex lists), no polynomial kernel is possible unless NP $\subseteq$ coNP/*poly*. In particular they give the following central theorem:

Theorem 1 (Mathieson and Szeider [23] Theorem 1.1)**.** *For all non-empty subsets S of $\{\mathsf{v}, \mathsf{e}, \mathsf{a}\}$ the problem* WDCE(S) *is fixed-parameter tractable for parameter $k + r$, and* W[1]*-hard for parameter k. If $\mathsf{v} \in S$ then $WDCE(S)$ remains* W[1]*-hard for parameter k even when all degree lists are restricted to $\{r\}$ and all vertices and edges have unit weight* 1*.*

Golovach [15] gives a concrete FPT algorithm for the unweighted case with parameter $k+r$ where vertex deletion and edge addition are allowed and shows that this case has no polynomial kernel unless NP $\subseteq$ coNP/*poly*. Froese *et al.*, in addition to the results mentioned above, show that the unweighted case with degree lists and edge addition has a kernel of size polynomial in $k + r$. In fact they show that either the instance is polynomial-time solvable or the kernel is polynomially-sized in r alone. Golovach [14] looks at the case where the target graph must also remain connected. Dabrowski *et al.* [7] look at the case where the input is planar and vertex deletion and edge deletion are allowed, and show that although still NP-complete, a kernel polynomially-sized in the number of deletions is obtainable. Belmonte *et al.* [1] study the

problem of using edge contraction to fulfil degree constraints.

1.1. Our Contribution

In this paper we look at problems with alternative forms of degree constraints: *edge-degree-regularity*, *edge-regularity* and *strong-regularity* (q.v. Section 2 for definitions). We show that for these constraints, and with any combination of vertex deletion, edge deletion and edge addition, these problems are typically fixed-parameter tractable with the combined parameter $k+r$, para-NP-complete with parameter r and W[1]-hard with parameter k.

We also consider the parameterization of certain WDCE problems by the treewidth of the input graph and show that finding an (induced) r-regular subgraph of graphs of bounded treewidth is in FPT and when edge addition is allowed, the problem becomes polynomial-time solvable.

2. Definitions and Notation

We denote the closed (integer) interval from a to b by $[a, b]$. If $a = 0$, we denote the interval $[0, b]$ by $[b]$. We denote the power set of a set X by $\mathcal{P}(X)$.

In this paper we consider only simple, undirected graphs. Given a graph $G = (V, E)$ and two vertices u and v we denote the edge $\{u, v\} \in E$ by uv or vu. The *open neighbourhood* $N_G(v)$ of a vertex v is the set $\{v \mid uv \in E\}$. The *closed neighbourhood* $N_G[u]$ of a vertex u is $N_G(u) \cup \{u\}$. The degree of a vertex u is denoted $d(u)$ and $d(u) = |N_G(u)|$. Given an edge $uv \in E$, the *edge-degree* $d_G(uv)$ is the sum of the degrees of u and v, i.e. $d_G(uv) = d_G(u) + d_G(v)$. A graph is *$r$-regular* if for all $u \in V$ we have $d_G(u) = r$. If a graph is r-regular for some r, it is *regular*. If for every edge $uv \in E$ we have $d_G(uv) = r$, we say G is *edge-degree-r-regular*. A graph is *(r, λ)-edge-regular* if every vertex has degree r and every edge uv has $|N_G(u) \cap N_G(v)| = \lambda$. A graph is *$(r, \lambda, \mu)$-strongly-regular* if it is (r, λ)-edge-regular and for every pair u, v of non-adjacent vertices we have $|N_G(u) \cap N_G(v)| = \mu$. The definitions are generalised to degree contraints in the problems we consider, see Section 2.2.

We consider three graph editing operations: vertex deletion, edge deletion and edge addition. For brevity we denote these by v, e and a respectively. In a weighted graph, the cost of deleting a vertex with weight w is w, the cost of deleting an edge with weight w and the cost of adding an edge with weight w is w. In an unweighted graph, the cost of each editing operation is 1.

Throughout this paper we consider a number of variants graph editing problems. In each case the input is a graph G along with a weight function ρ and a degree function δ. We extend the normal notation for the degree of a vertex to the weighted degree of a vertex, denoted $d^\rho(v)$. We also use this notation for the weighted edge-degree $d^\rho(uv)$.

For a given base editing problem Π, we denote by Π_1 the unweighted variant where $\rho(x) = 1$ for every x in the domain of ρ, by ${}_\infty\Pi$ we denote the variant where the editing cost is removed (i.e. k is no longer part of the problem), by Π^r the variant where $\delta(x) = r$ (equivalently $\delta(x) = \{r\}$) for a fixed r and all x in the domain of δ and by Π^* the variant where $\delta(x) = k_x$ (equivalently $\delta(x) = \{k_x\}$) for some k_x for all x in the domain of δ.

2.1. Compositional Problems and Polynomial Sized Kernels

For some problems we may suspect that they may not have kernels bounded by a polynomial in the parameter. Of course fixed-parameter tractability guarantees that they have a kernelization of some form, however this may also be impractical. Bodlaender *et al.* [3] develop a tool aimed at showing that problems do not have a polynomially sized kernel, based on some complexity theoretic assumptions.

Definition 2 (Composition)**.** A *composition algorithm* for a parameterized problem $(\mathcal{P}, \kappa)$ is an algorithm that receives as input a sequence $((x_1, k), \ldots, (x_t, k))$ of instances of $(\mathcal{P}, \kappa)$ and outputs in time bounded by a polynomial in $\sum_{i=1}^{t} |x_i| + k$ an instance (x', k') where:

1. (x', k') is a YES-instance of $(\mathcal{P}, \kappa)$ if and only if (x_i, k) is a YES-instance of $(\mathcal{P}, \kappa)$ for some $i \in \{1, \ldots, t\}$.
2. $k' = p(k)$ where p is a polynomial.

This definition is then accompanied by the key lemma:

Lemma 3 ([3])**.** *Let $(\mathcal{P}, \kappa)$ be a parameterized problem with a composition algorithm where the non-parameterized version of the problem $\mathcal{P}$ is* NP*-complete. Then if $(\mathcal{P}, \kappa)$ has a polynomially sized kernel, the Polynomial Hierarchy collapses to the third level.*

For details of the Polynomial Hierarchy we refer to Stockmeyer [33], and note that a collapse in the Polynomial Hierarchy seems unlikely [26].

Therefore any demonstration of the existence of a composition algorithm for a fixed-parameter tractable problem indicates that the problem is unlikely to have a polynomially sized kernel.

2.2. Problem Definitions

We now define the constraints of interest in this paper, and the consequent graph editing problems.

2.2.1. Edge-Degree Regularity

For an edge $uv \in E(G)$, the degree of uv, denoted $d(uv)$ and called the *edge-degree*, is the sum of the degrees of the endpoints, $d(u) + d(v)$. If for every edge $uv \in E(G)$ we have $d(uv) = r$, then G is *edge-degree r-regular*. Edge-degree constraints naturally extend vertex based degree constraints, notably any r-regular graph is edge-degree $2r$-regular. However an edge-degree regular graph may not be regular. Therefore the class of edge-degree regular graphs forms a proper superclass of the class of regular graphs.

We define the Weighted Edge Degree Constraint Editing problem, or WEDCE similarly to the WDCE problem.

WEDCE(S):
Instance: A graph $G = (V, E)$, two integers k and r, a weight function $\rho : V \cup E \to \{1, 2, \dots\}$, and a degree list function $\delta : E \to \mathcal{P}([r])$.
Question: Can we obtain from G a graph $G' = (V', E')$ using editing operations from S only, such that for all $uv \in E'$ we have $\sum_{uu' \in E'} \rho(uu') + \sum_{vv' \in E'} \rho(vv') \in \delta(uv)$, with total editing cost at most k?

We write $\text{WEDCE}_1(S)$ to indicate that the given graph is unweighted, and we write $\text{WEDCE}^*(S)$ if all degree lists are singletons; if all singletons are $\{r\}$ then we write $\text{WEDCE}^r(S)$. We omit set braces whenever the context allows, and write, for example, WEDCE(v) instead of WEDCE({v}).

2.2.2. Bounded Degree Graphs

Fellows *et al.* [10] generalise Vertex Cover to obtain the following problem (as Bounded-Degree Deletion):

Degree r Deletion:
Instance: A graph $G = (V, E)$, a positive integer k.
Question: Can at most k vertices be deleted from G such that no vertex has degree greater than r?

They give a $(r^3+4r^2+6r+4)\cdot k$ kernel via a generalisation of Nemhauser and Trotter's Theorem [25].

In line with previous results we define the following generalisation, Weighted Bounded Degree Editing (WBDE):

WBDE(S):

Instance:	A graph $G = (V, E)$, two integers k and r, a weight function $\rho : V \cup E \to \{1, 2, \dots\}$, and a degree function $\delta : V \to \{0, \dots, r\}$.
Question:	Can we obtain from G a graph $G' = (V', E')$ using editing operations from S only, such that for all $v \in V'$ we have $\sum_{uv \in E'} \rho(uv) \leq \delta(uv)$, with total editing cost at most k?

2.2.3. Edge Regularity

A graph G is (r, λ)-edge regular if every vertex has degree r and every edge $uv \in E(G)$ has $|N(u) \cap N(v)| = \lambda$. We define the Weighted Edge Regularity Editing (WERE) problem.

WERE(S):

Instance:	A graph $G = (V, E)$, three integers k, r and $\lambda \leq r$, a weight function $\rho : V \cup E \to \{1, 2, \dots\}$, a degree function $\delta : V \to \mathcal{P}([r])$, and a neighbourhood function $\nu : V \times V \to \mathcal{P}([\lambda])$.
Question:	Can we obtain from G a graph $G' = (V', E')$ using editing operations from S only, such that for all $v \in V'$ we have $\sum_{uv \in E'} \rho(uv) \in \delta(v)$ and for every $uv \in E'$ we have $\lvert N(u) \cap N(v)\rvert \in \nu(u, v)$, with total editing cost at most k?

Again we write WERE_1 when we consider unweighted graphs, and WERE^* when δ and ν are restricted to singletons. If δ and ν are restricted to $\{r\}$ and $\{\lambda\}$ respectively we write $\text{WERE}^{r,\lambda}$.

2.2.4. Strong Regularity

(r, λ, μ)-strongly regular graphs are (r, λ)-edge regular graphs where for all vertices $u, v \in V(G)$ such that $uv \notin E$ we have $|N(u) \cap N(v)| = \mu$. For this set of constraints, our problem becomes the Weighted Strongly Regular Editing (WSRE) problem.

WSRE(S):

Instance: A graph $G = (V, E)$, four integers k, r and $\lambda, \mu \leq r$, a weight function $\rho : V \cup E \to \{1, 2, \dots\}$, a degree function $\delta : V \to \mathcal{P}([r])$, and two neighbourhood functions $\nu : V \times V \to \mathcal{P}([\lambda])$ and $\xi : V \times V \to \mathcal{P}([\mu])$.

Question: Can we obtain from G a graph $G' = (V', E')$ using editing operations from S only, such that for all $v \in V'$ we have $\sum_{uv \in E'} \rho(uv) \in \delta(v)$, for every $uv \in E'$ we have $|N(u) \cap N(v)| \in \nu(u, v)$, and for every $uv \notin E'$ we have $|N(u) \cap N(v)| \in \xi(u, v)$, with total editing cost at most k?

We denote the case where δ, ν and ξ are restricted to singletons by WSRE*.

3. Edge-Degree Regular Graphs

Edge addition as a general operation is ill-defined for this probem, much as vertex addition makes little sense in the WDCE context, as the addition of a new edge requires the invention of constraints for that edge. Thus we restrict ourselves to vertex deletion and edge deletion.

The NP-completeness and W[1]-hardness for parameter k of $\mathrm{WEDCE}_1^r(S)$ where $\mathsf{v} \in S$ follow from the proof of Theorem 3.3 in [23] as the graph constructed will be edge-degree $2r$-regular if and only if the same set of vertex deletions can be made as for the r-regular case.

When $S = \{\mathsf{e}\}$ the NP-completeness of $\mathrm{WEDCE}_1^3(\mathsf{e})$ is established by the NP-completeness of Maximum H-Packing [16], and more particularly by the $K_{1,2}$-Packing subproblem [28], obtained by setting $\delta(uv) = \{3\}$ for all edges $uv \in E(G)$.

$K_{1,2}$-Packing:

Instance: A graph G, an integer k.

Question: Does G contain at least k vertex-disjoint copies of the complete bipartite graph $K_{1,2}$?

Of course this immediately gives the following:

Proposition 4. $\mathrm{WEDCE}_1^r(\mathsf{e})$ *is* para-NP*-complete for parameter* r*.*

It is a necessary condition for edge-degree r-regularity that the line graph is r-regular, however we cannot simply convert the graph to the line graph and perform the editing there, as the deletion of a vertex in the original graph does not have the same effect as the deletion of an edge in the line graph.

3.1. A Bounded Search Tree Algorithm for WEDCE(v, e*)*

Consider the case where both edge deletion and vertex deletion are allowed. Any isolated vertex can be discarded, as it will play no part in the edge-degree of any edge (this can be done without reducing k).

The algorithm, again based on Moser and Thilikos' [24], runs as follows:

1. If $k \geq 0$ and for all edges uv, $d^\rho(uv) \in \delta(uv)$, answer Yes. If $k \leq 0$ and there exists an edge uv with $d^\rho(uv) \notin \delta(uv)$, answer No.
2. Choose an edge uv with $d^\rho(uv) \notin \delta(uv)$.
3. Arbitrarily select at most $r+1$ vertices from $M = N(u) \cup N(v) \setminus \{u, v\}$. Let E_M denote the edges with with both endpoints in $N[u] \setminus \{v\}$ or $N[v] \setminus \{u\}$.
4. Branch on all possibilities of deleting u, v, uv, one element x of M or reducing the weight of one edge in E_M by 1. Reduce k by the weight of the deleted element in the first four cases, and by one if an edge is reduced in weight.
5. Return to step 1.

The branching set consists of an edge uv where $d^\rho(u) + d^\rho(v) \notin \delta(uv)$, u, v at most $r+1$ neighbours of u and v, and the edges between u and v and the $r+1$ neighbours. The branching set has at most $2r+5$ elements, thus the tree has at most $\mathrm{tr}(2r+5, k) = ((2r+5)^{k+1} - 1)/(2r+4)$ vertices.

This gives the following result:

Lemma 5. $\mathrm{WEDCE}(S)$ *is fixed-parameter tractable for parameter* (k, r) *where* $\emptyset \neq S \subseteq \{\mathsf{v}, \mathsf{e}\}$*.*

If only vertex deletion is allowed, the branching set may be reduced, resulting in a tree with at most $\mathrm{tr}(r+3, k) = ((r+3)^{k+1} - 1)/(r+2)$ vertices.

3.2. A Kernelization for WEDCE$^*(\mathsf{v}, \mathsf{e})$

$\mathrm{WEDCE}^*(\mathsf{v}, \mathsf{e})$ admits a kernelization similar to $\mathrm{WDCE}(\mathsf{v}, \mathsf{e})$.

3.2.1. Reduction Rules

Reduction Rule 1. Let $(G, (k, r))$ be an instance of WEDCE$^*(S)$. If there is a vertex v in G such that $d^\rho(v) > k + r$, then replace $(G, (k, r))$ with $(G', (k', r))$ where $G' = G - v$ and $k' = k - \rho(v)$.

Reduction Rule 1 for the WDCE* problem [23] states that given a vertex v of degree greater than $k + r$, if there is a solution with at most k deletions, v must be deleted and k reduced by $\rho(v)$. This rule also holds for WEDCE*.

Claim 6. *Reduction Rule 1 is sound for* WEDCE$^*(S)$ *with* $\{\mathsf{v}\} \subseteq S \subseteq \{\mathsf{v}, \mathsf{e}\}$.

Proof. Assume there is a vertex $v \in V(G)$ with $d(v) > k + r$, then every edge uv has edge-degree at least $k + r + 1$ therefore at least $k + 1$ vertices or edges must be deleted if we do not delete v, but we may only perform at most k deletions.

Thus $(G, (k, r))$ is a YES-instance of WEDCE$^*(S)$ if and only if $(G', (k', r))$ is a YES-instance of WEDCE$^*(S)$. □

We now adapt the notion of a clean region [24, 23] for WEDCE. An edge uv is clean if $\delta(uv) = d^\rho(uv)$. Let X be the set of vertices only incident on clean edges. A clean region C is a maximal connected subgraph of G whose vertices are all in X (or equivalently, a connected component of $G[X]$). We denote the vertices (resp. edges) of C by $V(C)$ (resp. $E(C)$). As before let the i-th layer of C be the subset $C_i = \{c \in V(C) \mid \min_{b \in B} d_G(c, b) = i\}$ where $d_G(c, b)$ denotes the distance between c and b in G. Note that all the neighbors of a vertex of layer C_i belong to $C_{i-1} \cup C_i \cup C_{i+1}$.

Reduction Rule 2 for WDCE* holds immediately with this new definition of a clean region as independent clean regions will not have any elements deleted in a minimal solution.

Reduction Rule 2. Let $(G, (k, r))$ be an instance of WDCE$^*(S)$, let C be a clean region of G with empty boundary $B(C) = \emptyset$, and let $G' = G - V(C)$. Then replace $(G, (k, r))$ with $(G', (k, r))$.

If any element of a clean region is deleted, then the entire region must be, however with both v and e it is not clear as to the most efficient way to delete a clean region. We do know that if any element from a layer with index greater than $k + 1$ is deleted, either there is a solution where that element is not deleted, or there have been more than k deletions.

Reduction Rule 3. Let $(G, (k, r))$ be an instance of WEDCE$^*(S)$ and let C be a clean region of G such that $C_{k+2} \neq \emptyset$. Replace $(G, (k, r))$ with $(G', (k, r))$ as follows:

1. Delete all layers C_i where $i \geq k + 2$.
2. For each edge uv such that $u \in C_{k+1}$ and $v \in C_{k+1} \cup C_k$ set $\delta(uv)$ to $d^\rho(uv)$.

Claim 7. *Reduction Rule 3 is sound for* WEDCE$^*(S)$ *with* $\emptyset \neq S \subseteq \{\mathsf{v}, \mathsf{e}\}$.

Proof. Let D be the set of vertices and edges deleted in a minimal solution for $(G, (k, r))$. Let $G(D)$ be the subgraph induced by all the vertices of D or incident to edges of D. Each connected component X of $G(D)$ that contains an element of a clean region C must also contain an element of the boundary $B(C)$, otherwise we could obtain a solution of lower cost by not deleting X. Therefore each vertex $v \in D \cap V(C)$ must be of distance at most $|D|$ from a vertex in $B(C)$, thus there is no vertex $v \in C_i$ where $i \geq k+1$. Similarly any endpoint of an edge in $e \in D \cap E(C)$ must belong to some layer C_i where $i \leq k + 1$. Conversely any solution D' for $(G', (k, r))$ is also a solution for $(G, (k, r))$ □

If the editing operations are restricted to e, we can apply the following reduction rule. In this case we may contract the clean regions significantly. Note that here the weights of the vertices are irrelevant.

Reduction Rule 4. Let $(G, (k, r))$ be an instance of WEDCE$^*(S)$. Let C be a clean region with boundary $B(C)$ and $|V(C)| \geq 2$. We replace $(G, (k, r))$ with $(G'(k, r))$ by contracting C to a single edge as follows:

1. Add two vertices u and v and the edge uv.
2. For each $b \in B(C)$ add an edge bu with weight $\rho(bu) = \min(k + 1, \sum_{c \in V(C)} \rho(bc))$.
3. For each $b \in B(C)$ set $\delta(bu) = d^\rho(b) + d^\rho(u)$.
4. Let $\rho(uv) = \min(k + 1, \sum_{x,y \in V(C), xy \in C} \rho(xy))$.
5. Let $\delta(uv) = d^\rho(u) + d^\rho(v) = d^\rho(u) + 1$.
6. Delete C.

Claim 8. *Reduction Rule 4 is sound for* WEDCE$^*(\mathsf{e})$.

Proof. Let $(G, (k, r))$ be an instance of WEDCE$^*(\mathsf{e})$ with clean region C having boundary $B(C)$. Let $(G', (k, r))$ be the instance obtained by applying Reduction Rule 4.

If an edge incident on a vertex of $V(C) \cup B(C)$ is deleted, then an edge of C will no longer be clean. Therefore the edge must be deleted, similarly rendering other edges of C no longer clean. This cascades, and all the edges of the clean region must be deleted with total cost equal to the sum of the cost of all the edges in the clean region. Therefore any solution for $(G, (k, r))$ either deletes all edges in C or none. Therefore C can be represented by a single edge of appropriate weight, which we can limit to $k+1$, as this weight or higher prevents deletion. □

3.2.2. Kernelization Lemmas

Lemma 9. *Let* $\{\mathsf{v}\} \subseteq S \subseteq \{\mathsf{v}, \mathsf{e}\}$. *Let* $(G, (k, r))$ *be a* YES*-instance of* WEDCE$^*(S)$ *reduced under Reduction Rules 1, 2 and 3. Then* $|V(G)| \leq k(1 + (k + r)(1 + r^{k+1})) = O(k^2 r^{k+1} + k r^{k+2})$.

Proof. The proof runs identically to Lemma 6.4 in [23]. □

For WEDCE$^*(\mathsf{e})$ we can do much better.

Lemma 10. *Let* $(G, (k, r))$ *be a* YES*-instance of* WEDCE$^*(\mathsf{e})$ *reduced under Reduction Rules 1, 2 and 4. Then* $|V(G)| \leq 2k + 4kr = O(kr)$.

Proof. Let D be the set of edges deleted in the solution. Let H be the set of vertices incident to elements of D and let X be the remaining vertices of the graph . $|D| \leq k$ by definition. As e is the only operation, D consists entirely of edges. Therefore $H \leq 2 \cdot |D| \leq 2k$.

Claim 11. $|X| \leq 2r \cdot |H|$.

As $G - D$ is clean, the edges of $G - D$ incident to vertices of H must have edge-degree at most r. Therefore the vertices of H have degree at most r in $G - D$ and all neighbours in X must be vertices of clean regions. Furthermore Reduction Rule 7 any clean regions in the graph have at most 2 vertices. The claim follows.

As $|V(G)| = |H| = |X|$, $|V(G)| \leq 2k + 4kr$. □

Combining these kernelizations, we obtain the following Theorem:

Theorem 12. *Let* $\emptyset \neq S \subseteq \{\mathsf{v}, \mathsf{e}\}$. WEDCE$^*(S)$ *is fixed-parameter tractable with a kernel with* $O(k^2 r^{k+1} + k r^{k+2})$ *vertices. If* $S = \{\mathsf{e}\}$, *the kernel has* $O(kr)$ *vertices.*

4. Bounded Degree Graphs

As we have only an upper bound on the degree, edge addition again makes no sense as an operation. Naturally degree lists are also no longer sensible, so we only consider the case where δ is a singleton for all vertices.

4.1. A Kernelization for WBDE(v, e)

4.1.1. Reduction Rules

Naturally Reduction Rule 1 (see Section 3.2.1) applies immediately.

Again we redefine the notion of clean regions for this problem. A clean region $C \subseteq V(G)$ is a maximal connected set of vertices such that for all $c \in C$ we have $d^{\rho}(c) \leq \delta(c)$. The boundary $B(C)$ of C is the set of vertices that is adjacent to vertices of C but not in C.

With this new definition, Reduction Rule 2 (Section 3.2.1) also applies directly.

Again we define the layers of a clean region; let the i-th layer of C be the subset $C_i = \{c \in V(C) \mid \min_{b \in B} d_G(c, b) = i\}$ where $d_G(c, b)$ denotes is the distance between c and b in G. Note that all the neighbors of a vertex of layer C_i belong to $C_{i-1} \cup C_i \cup C_{i+1}$.

Reduction Rule 5. Let $(G, (k, r))$ be an instance of WBDE(S) with clean region C. Replace $(G, (k, r))$ with a new instance $(G', (k, r))$ where G' is obtained from G by deleting all layers C_i of C where $i \geq 1$.

Claim 13. *Reduction Rule 5 is sound for* WBDE(S) *with* $\emptyset \neq S \subseteq \{\mathsf{v}, \mathsf{e}\}$.

Proof. Let D be a set of deleted vertices and edges. If D contains any vertices or edges from any layer C_i where $i > 1$, we may replace D with a new solution D' where those vertices and edges are not deleted. As C is clean, the solution will still be correct. □

4.1.2. Kernelization Lemma

Lemma 14. *Let* $\emptyset \neq S \subseteq \{\mathsf{v}, \mathsf{e}\}$. *Let* $(G, (k, r))$ *be a* YES*-instance of* WBDE(S) *reduced under Reduction Rules 1, 2 and 5.* $|V(G)| \leq k + k(k + r) + kr(k + r) = O(kr(k + r))$.

Proof. We partition G into three sets, D, H and X, where D is the set of vertices and edges deleted in the solution, H is the set of vertices adjacent and incident to vertices and edges in D and X is the remaining vertices of the graph. As before H separates D and X, thus no element of X has a neighbour or adjacent edge outside of $H \cup X$. $|D| \leq k$ by definition.

Claim 15. $|H| \leq |D| \cdot (k + r)$.

By Reduction Rule 1 no vertex has degree greater than $k + r$, therefore each edge in D has at most 2 incident vertices in H and each vertex at most $k + r$ neighbours.

Claim 16. $|X| \leq |H| \cdot r$.

$G \setminus D$ is clean, therefore vertices in H have at most r neighbours. As X consists entirely of clean regions, by Reduction Rule 8, every element of X must be adjacent to some element of H.

Therefore $|V(G)| = |D| + |H| + |X| \leq k + k(k + r) + kr(k + r)$. □

Lemma 17. WBDE(S) *is fixed-parameter tractable for parameter* (k, r) *where with* $\emptyset \neq S \subseteq \{\mathsf{v}, \mathsf{e}\}$.

5. Edge Regular Graphs

The W[1]-hardness and NP-completeness of $\text{WERE}_1^*(S)$ and subsequently WERE(S) with $\{\mathsf{v}\} \neq S \subseteq \{\mathsf{v}, \mathsf{e}, \mathsf{a}\}$ follow immediately from Theorem 3.3 in [23], as the solution required for the proof must be edge regular.

5.1. A Bounded Search Tree Algorithm for WERE(v, e*)*

If any vertex v has $d^\rho < h$ for all $h \in \delta(v)$ it can only be deleted, and k reduced by $\rho(v)$. Then the algorithm is:

1. If $k \geq 0$ and for every vertex v we have $d^\rho(v) \in \delta(v)$ and for every edge uv we have $|N(u) \cap N(v)| \in \nu(u, v)$ answer Yes. If $k \leq 0$ and there exists a vertex v with $d^\rho(v) \notin \delta(v)$ or an edge uv with $|N(u) \cap N(v)| \notin \nu(u, v)$ answer No.
2. Choose a vertex v with $d^\rho(v) \notin \delta(v)$, or incident to an edge uv with $|N(u) \cap N(v)| \notin \nu(u, v)$.
3. Arbitrarily select at most $r + 1$ vertices from $N(v)$. Let E_v denote the edges with with both endpoints in $N[v]$.
4. Branch on all possibilities of deleting, v, one element x of $N(v)$ or reducing the weight of one edge in E_v by 1. Reduce k by the weight of the deleted element in the first two cases, and by one if an edge is reduced in weight.
5. Return to step 1.

The branching set for this problem is more complex. In both cases we choose an element from $V(G) \cup E(G)$. If the element chosen is a vertex v with $d^\rho(v) \notin \delta(v)$, it consists of v, at most $r+1$ neighbours of v and the edges between v and the chosen neighbours. If the element chosen is an edge uv with $|N(u) \cap N(v)| \notin \nu(u,v)$, it consists of uv, u, v, at most $r+1$ neighbours of u and v, and the edges between u and v and the chosen neighbours. Therefore the tree has at most $\mathrm{tr}(3r+6,k) = ((3r+6)^{k+1}-1)/(3r+5)$ vertices. As with previous cases, restricting the available operations to v gives a smaller bound on the tree size. With only v the branching set is reduced to at most $r+3$ elements, so the maximum number of vertices in the tree is reduced to $\mathrm{tr}(r+3,k) = ((r+3)^{k+1}-1)/(r+2)$.

Lemma 18. $\mathrm{WERE}(S)$ *is fixed-parameter tractable with paramter* (k,r) *with* $\emptyset \neq S \subseteq \{\mathsf{v},\mathsf{e}\}$.

5.2. A Kernelization for WERE$^*(\mathsf{v},\mathsf{e})$

As before the $\mathrm{WDCE}^*(\mathsf{v},\mathsf{e})$ kernelization can be adapted for $\mathrm{WERE}^*(\mathsf{v},\mathsf{e})$ using an adapted definition of a clean region. As we are dealing with singleton sets for the degree function δ (resp. the neighbourhood function ν) we write $d = \delta(v)$ (resp. $d = \nu(u,v)$) instead of $d \in \delta(v)$ (resp. $d \in \nu(u,v)$).

5.2.1. Reduction Rules

As an edge regular graph is by definition regular, Reduction Rule 1 (*q.v.* Section 3.2.1) applies immediately.

We redefine a clean region as a maximal connected set $C \subseteq V(G)$ of vertices such that for every vertex $v \in C$ we have $d^\rho(v) = \delta(v)$ and for every edge $uv \in E(G)$ incident to v we have $|N(u) \cap N(v)| = \nu(u,v)$. The layers of C are defined as in Section 3.2.1. We note that it follows immediately that for $u \in B(C)$ and $v \in C$ if $uv \in E$ then $N(u) \cap N(v) \subseteq B(C) \cup C_1$.

With this modified definition of a clean region, Reduction Rule 2 (*q.v.* Section 3.2.1) also applies with no change.

We now only require an appropriate alternative for Reduction Rule 4.

Reduction Rule 6. Let $(G,(k,r))$ be an instance of $\mathrm{WERE}^*(S)$. Let C be a clean region with boundary $B(C)$. We replace $(G,(k,r))$ with $(G',(k,r))$ by shrinking C to a single layer of vertices as follows:

1. Delete all vertices $v \in C \setminus C_1$.
2. Add all edges uv where $u,v \in C_1$.

3. For all edges uv where $u, v \in C_1$, set $\nu(u, v)$ to $|N(u) \cap N(v)|$.
4. For all vertices $v \in C_1$, set $\delta(v)$ to $d^{\rho}(v)$.
5. Arbitrarily choose a vertex $v \in C_1$ and set $\rho(v)$ to $\min(k+1, \rho(v) + \sum_{u \in C \setminus C_1} \rho(u))$.

Claim 19. *Reduction Rule 6 is sound for* $\text{WERE}^*(S)$ *with* $\{\mathsf{v}\} \subseteq S \subseteq \{\mathsf{v}, \mathsf{e}\}$.

Proof. As with Reduction Rule 4, if a neighbour, incident edge, or vertex of clean region is deleted, the entire clean region must be deleted. As the replacement clean region is connected, ν is satisfied for all vertices in C, and the weight is the same or $k+1$, this property and the cost of deletion is preserved.

As all vertices in $B(C)$ have their neighbours in the clean region confined to C_1, the retention of C_1 ensures that the neighbourhoods with regard to ν are also preserved. □

5.2.2. Kernelization Lemma

Lemma 20. *Let* $\{\mathsf{v}\} \subseteq S \subseteq \{\mathsf{v}, \mathsf{e}\}$. *Let* $(G, (k, r))$ *be a* YES*-instance of* $\text{WERE}^*(S)$ *reduced under Reduction Rules 1, 2 and 6. Then* $|V(G)| \leq k + k(k+r) + kr(k+r) = O(kr(k+r))$.

Proof. We partition G into disjoint sets D, H and X where D is the set of vertices and edges deleted to obtain the edge regular graph, H is the set of vertices incident or adjacent to elements of D that are not themselves in D and X is the set of remaining vertices in neither D nor H. H separates D from X. By definition $|D| \leq k$.

We also have $|H| \leq |D| \cdot (k+r)$.

Claim 21. $|X| \leq r \cdot |H|$.

As removing D leaves the graph edge regular, the vertices of H can have at most r neighbours outside of D, in particular they can have at most r neighbours in X. Furthermore all vertices in X must belong to some clean region in the original graph, therefore by Reduction Rules 2 and 8, all the vertices in X must be adjacent to some vertex in H. The claim follows.

We have $|V(G)| \leq |D| + |H| + |X| \leq k + k(k+r) + kr(k+r)$. □

Subsequently we have the following:

Lemma 22. $\text{WERE}^*(S)$ *is fixed parameter-tractable with parameter* (k, r) *where* $\{\mathsf{v}\} \subseteq S \subseteq \{\mathsf{v}, \mathsf{e}\}$.

As we only have deletion operations, we can represent an unweighted graph as a weighted graph where all elements have weight 1.

Corollary 23. $\mathrm{WERE}^{r,\lambda}(S)$, $\mathrm{WERE}_1^*(S)$ *and* $\mathrm{WERE}_1^{r,\lambda}(S)$ *are fixed parameter-tractable with parameter* (k, r) *where* $\{\mathsf{v}\} \subseteq S \subseteq \{\mathsf{v}, \mathsf{e}\}$.

6. Strongly Regular Graphs

6.1. A Kernelization for WSRE$^*(\mathsf{v}, \mathsf{e})$*

6.1.1. Reduction Rules

Again Reduction Rule 1 (*q.v.* Section 3.2.1) holds with no change, and once the appropriate notion of clean region has been defined, Reduction Rule 2 also holds.

In this case the definition of a clean region is the obvious extension of the clean region for WERE, where for each vertex v in the clean C region and every vertex u where $uv \notin E$ we have $|N(u) \cap N(v)| = \xi(u, v)$.

Reduction Rule 7. Let $(G, (k, r))$ be an instance of $\mathrm{WSRE}^*(S)$. Let C be a clean region with boundary $B(C)$. We replace $(G, (k, r))$ with $(G', (k, r))$ by shrinking C by removing all but C_1 and C_2 as follows:

1. Delete $C \setminus (C_1 \cup C_2)$.
2. Add all edges uv where $u, v \in C_1 \cup C_2$.
3. For every vertex $v \in C_2$ set $\delta(v)$ to $d^\rho(v)$.
4. For every vertex $v \in C_1 \cup C_2$ and every vertex $u \in V(G)$, if $uv \in E$ set $\nu(u, v)$ to $|N(u) \cap N(v)|$, if $uv \notin E$ set $\xi(u, v)$ to $|N(u) \cap N(v)|$.
5. Arbitrarily choose a vertex $v \in C_1 \cup C_2$ and set $\rho(v)$ to $\min(k + 1, \sum_{u \in C \setminus (C_1 \cup C_2)} \rho(u))$.

Claim 24. *Reduction Rule 7 is sound for* $\mathrm{WSRE}^*(S)$ *with* $\{\mathsf{v}\} \subseteq S \subseteq \{\mathsf{v}, \mathsf{e}\}$.

Proof. The new clean region remains a clean region, and the total weight, if less than $k + 1$ is the same. Any total weight greater than k is equivalent, as we cannot delete the clean region in any of those cases.

As C is a clean region, if there is a vertex v with $xi(u, v) > 0$ for some vertex $u \in C$, then $d(u, v) \leq 2$. Therefore we do not affect vertices outside of the clean region by removing all layers C_i for $i \geq 3$. □

6.1.2. Kernelization Lemma

Lemma 25. *Let* $\{\mathsf{v}\} \subseteq S \subseteq \{\mathsf{v}, \mathsf{e}\}$. *Let* $(G, (k, r))$ *be a* YES*-instance of* $\mathrm{WSRE}^*(S)$ *reduced under Reduction Rules 1, 2 and 7. Then* $|V(G)| \leq k + k(k+r) + kr(r+1)(k+r) = O(kr^2(k+r))$.

Proof. We partition G into disjoint sets D, H and X where D is the set of vertices and edges deleted to obtain the edge regular graph, H is the set of vertices incident or adjacent to elements of D that are not themselves in D and X is the set of remaining vertices in neither D nor H. H separates D from X. By definition $|D| \leq k$.

Further, $|H| \leq |D| \cdot (k + r)$.

Claim 26. $|X| \leq r(r+1) \cdot |H|$.

As removing D leaves the graph edge regular, the vertices of H can have at most r neighbours outside of D, in particular they can have at most r neighbours in X. Furthermore all vertices in X must belong to some clean region in the original graph, therefore by Reduction Rules 2 and 9, all the vertices in X must be at most distance 2 from some vertex in H. Therefore the first layer C_1 of a clean region C is of size at most $r \cdot |H|$, and the second is of size at most $r^2 \cdot |H|$. The claim then follows.

We have $|V(G)| \leq |D| + |H| + |X| \leq k + k(k+r) + kr(r+1)(k+r)$. □

This gives the following:

Lemma 27. $\mathrm{WSRE}^*(S)$ *is fixed-parameter tractable with parameter* (k, r) *where* $\{\mathsf{v}\} \subseteq S\{\mathsf{v}, \mathsf{e}\}$.

As before the employment of only deletion operations allows the representation of an unweighted graph as a weighted graph.

Corollary 28. $\mathrm{WSRE}^{r,\lambda,\mu}(S)$, $\mathrm{WSRE}_1^*(S)$ *and* $\mathrm{WSRE}_1^{r,\lambda,\mu}(S)$ *are fixed parameter-tractable with parameter* (k, r) *where* $\{\mathsf{v}\} \subseteq S \subseteq \{\mathsf{v}, \mathsf{e}\}$.

6.2. Fixed-Parameter Tractability for WSRE and WERE with Edge Addition

If we consider the case of $\mathrm{WSRE}(S)$ where $\{\mathsf{v}, \mathsf{a}\} \subseteq S$, and for every vertex v we have $\nu(v) = \xi(v) = \{0, \ldots, r\}$, then the problem is reduced to $\mathrm{WDCE}(S)$. By the NP-completeness and compositionality of EDGE REPLACEMENT SET (*q.v.* [22, 23]) we would expect that in general $\mathrm{WSRE}^*(S)$ and subsequently $\mathrm{WSRE}(S)$ would have no polynomial time kernelization that relied upon choosing vertices from clean regions to delete to obtain edge

addition points, and that WSRE$^*(S)$ and subsequently WSRE(S) would have no polynomial sized kernel unless the Polynomial Hierarchy collapses to the third level, by Lemma 3. The same arguments apply to WERE.

However we can still apply the logic approach used in [23] to demonstrate fixed-parameter tractability for WSRE(S) and WERE(S) with $\emptyset \neq S \subseteq \{\mathsf{v}, \mathsf{e}, \mathsf{a}\}$. In fact as we still require the graphs to satisfy the basic degree constraint δ, we can extend the existing formulæ from [23]. We represent a graph by its incidence structure, with the additional relations W_i and D_i as in [23]. To the vocubulary we add a further two sets of binary relations N_i with $0 \leq i \leq r$ and M_j with $0 \leq j \leq r$ which encode the functions ν and ξ respectively, i.e., for a pair of vertices $u, v \in V(G)$ $N_i uv$ is true if and only if $i \in \nu(uv)$, similarly $M_i uv$ is true if and only if $i \in \xi(uv)$. By setting $\xi(u, v) = \{0, \ldots, r\}$ for all vertices u, v we can represent WERE with no change to the logic (in fact we may represent another otherwise undefined problem where $\nu(v) = \{0, \ldots, r\}$ but $\xi(u, v)$ does not).

To each formula ϕ_k as defined in [23], we add two subformulæ $\forall uv\psi'_k$ and $\forall uv\psi''_k$ by conjunction.

First we repeat the construction of ϕ_k, presented as in the previous work [23]:

$$\phi_k = \bigvee_{k',k'',k'''\in[k] \text{ such that } k'+k''+k'''\leq k} \exists u_1, \ldots, u_{k'}, e_1, \ldots, e_{k''}, a_1, \ldots, a_{k'''}, b_1, \ldots, b_{k'''}(\phi'_k \wedge \forall v\, \phi''_k)$$

where ϕ'_k and ϕ''_k are given below. The subformula ϕ'_k is the conjunction of the clauses (1)–(3) and ensures that $u_1, \ldots, u_{k'}$ represent deleted vertices, $e_1, \ldots e_{k''}$ represent deleted edges, a_i, b_i, $1 \leq i \leq k'''$ represent end points of added edges, and the total editing cost is at most k. Note that since added edges are not present in the given structure we need to express them in terms vertex pairs. For the unweighted case we must also include subformulæ (4) and (5) to ensure that the addition of edges does not produce parallel edges. By restricting k', k'' or k''' to zero as appropriate we can express which editing operations are available.

(1) $\bigwedge_{i\in[k']} Vu_i \wedge \bigwedge_{i\in[k'']} Ee_i$ "u_i is a vertex, e_i is an edge;"

(2) $\bigwedge_{i\in[k''']} Va_i \wedge Vb_i \wedge a_i \neq b_i \wedge \bigwedge_{j\in[k']}(u_j \neq a_i \wedge u_j \neq b_i)$ "a_i and b_i are distinct vertices and not deleted;"

(3) $\bigvee_{w_1,\ldots,w_{k'}\in[k'] \text{ such that } \sum_{i\in[k']} w_i + k'' + k''' \leq k} \bigwedge_{i\in[k']} W_{w_i} u_i$ "the weight of deleted vertices is correct;"

(4) $\bigwedge_{1\leq i<j\leq k''}(a_i \neq b_j \vee a_j \neq b_i) \wedge (a_i \neq a_j \vee b_i \neq b_j)$ "the pairs of vertices are mutually distinct;"

(5) $\bigwedge_{i\in[k''']} \forall y(\neg I a_i y \vee \neg I b_i y)$ "a_i and b_i are not adjacent."

The subformula ϕ''_k ensures that after editing each vertex v has degree $l \in \delta(v)$.

$$\phi''_k = (Vv \wedge \bigwedge_{i\in[k']} v \neq u_i) \rightarrow \bigvee_{l\in[r]} D_l v \wedge \bigvee_{\substack{l',l''\in[l]\\ l'+l''=l}} \exists x_1,\ldots,x_{l'},y_1,\ldots,y_{l''}\ \phi'''_k,$$

where ϕ'''_k is the conjunction of the clauses (6)–(12).

(6) $\bigwedge_{i\in[l']} Ivx_i$ "v is incident with l' edges;"

(7) $\bigwedge_{1\leq i<j\leq l'} x_i \neq x_j$ "the edges are all different;"

(8) $\bigwedge_{i\in[l'],j\in[k'']} x_i \neq e_j$ "the edges have not been deleted;"

(9) $\bigwedge_{i\in[l'],j\in[k']} \neg I u_j x_i$ "the ends of the edges have not been deleted;"

(10) $\forall x(Ivx \rightarrow \bigvee_{i\in[l']} x = x_i \vee \bigvee_{i\in[k'']} x = e_i \vee \bigvee_i Ixu_i)$ "v is not incident with any further edges except deleted edges;"

(11) $\bigwedge_{i\in[l'']} \bigvee_{j\in[k''']}(y_i = a_j \wedge v = b_j) \vee (y_i = b_j \wedge v = a_j)$ "v is incident with at least l'' added edges;"

(12) $\bigwedge_{j\in[l'']}(v = a_j \rightarrow \bigvee_i y_i = b_j) \wedge (v = b_j \rightarrow \bigvee_{j\in[l'']} y_i = a_j)$ "v is incident with at most l'' added edges."

To this we include further subformulæ to accomodate the edge constraints. The subformula ψ'_k ensures that if two vertices u and v are adjacent, then $\nu(u,v)$ is satisfied.

$$\psi'_k = (Vu \wedge Vv \wedge \bigwedge_{i\in[k']}(u_i \neq u \wedge u_i \neq v) \wedge \exists e(Iue \wedge Ive \wedge \bigwedge_{i\in[k'']}(e_i \neq e))) \rightarrow \bigvee_{l\in[r]} N_l uv \wedge \bigvee_{\substack{l',m',l'',m''\in[l]\\ l'+m'=l''+m''=l}} \exists n_1\ldots n_l x_1\ldots x_{l'} y_1\ldots y_{m'} w_1\ldots w_{l''} z_1\ldots z_{m''} \psi'''_k$$

Where ψ'''_k is the conjuction of clauses (13)–(30):

(13) $\bigwedge_{i\neq j\in[l]} Vn_i \wedge n_i \neq n_j \wedge u \neq n_i \wedge v \neq n_j$ "the n_is are distinct vertices, different from u and v;"

(14) $\bigwedge_{i\in[l],j\in[k']} n_i \neq u_j$ "the n_is have not been deleted;"

(15) $\bigwedge_{i\neq j\in[l']} Ex_i \wedge x_i \neq x_j$ "the x_is are distinct edges;"

(16) $\bigwedge_{i\in[l'],j\in[k'']} x_i \neq e_j$ "the x_is have not been deleted;"

(17) $\bigwedge_{i\neq j\in[m']} Vy_i \wedge y_i \neq y_j$ "the y_is are distinct vertices;"
(18) $\bigwedge_{i\in[m'],j\in[k']} y_i \neq u_j$ "the y_is have not been deleted;"
(19) $\bigwedge_{i\in[m']} \bigvee_{j\in[l]} y_i = n_j$ "the y_is are equal to some n_j;"
(20) $\bigwedge_{i\in[l']}(Iux_i \wedge \bigvee_{j\in[l]} In_jx_i \wedge \bigwedge_{t\in[m']} n_j \neq y_t)$ "the x_is are adjacent to u and some n_j which is not equal to any y_t;"
(21) $\bigwedge_{i\in[m']} \bigvee_{j\in[k''']}(u = a_j \wedge y_i = b_j) \vee (u = b_j \wedge y_i = a_j)$ "y_i and u are the endpoints of some added edge;"
(22) $\bigwedge_{i\in[k''']} a_i = u \vee b_i = u \rightarrow \bigvee_{j\in[m']} a_i = y_j \vee b_i = y_j$ "u is incident on no other added edges."
(23) $\bigwedge_{i\neq j\in[l'']} Ew_i \wedge w_i \neq w_j$ "the w_is are distinct edges;"
(24) $\bigwedge_{i\in[l''],j\in[k'']} w_i \neq e_j$ "the w_is have not been deleted;"
(25) $\bigwedge_{i\neq j\in[m'']} Vz_i \wedge z_i \neq z_j$ "the z_is are distinct vertices;"
(26) $\bigwedge_{i\in[m''],j\in[k']} z_i \neq u_j$ "the z_is have not been deleted;"
(27) $\bigwedge_{i\in[m'']} \bigvee_{j\in[l]} z_i = n_j$ "the z_is are equal to some n_j;"
(28) $\bigwedge_{i\in[l'']}(Iuw_i \wedge \bigvee_{j\in[l]} In_jw_i \wedge \bigwedge_{t\in[m'']} n_j \neq z_t)$ "the w_is are adjacent to u and some n_j which is not equal to any z_t;"
(29) $\bigwedge_{i\in[m'']} \bigvee_{j\in[k''']}(u = a_j \wedge z_i = b_j) \vee (u = b_j \wedge z_i = a_j)$ "z_i and u are the endpoints of some added edge;"
(30) $\bigwedge_{i\in[k''']} a_i = u \vee b_i = u \rightarrow \bigvee_{j\in[m'']} a_i = z_j \vee b_i = z_j$ "u is incident on no other added edges."

The subformula ψ''_k ensures that for two nonadjacent vertices u and v, $\xi(u, v)$ is satisfied. ψ''_k is essentially identical to ψ'_k, and we can re-use the subformula ψ'''_k.

$$\psi'_k = (Vu \wedge Vv \wedge \bigwedge_{i\in[k']}(u_i \neq u \wedge u_i \neq v) \wedge \forall e(\neg Iue \vee \neg Ive \vee \bigwedge_{i\in[k'']}(e_i \neq e))) \rightarrow \bigvee_{l\in[r]} M_l uv \wedge \bigvee_{\substack{l',m',l'',m''\in[l] \\ l'+m'=l''+m''=l}} \exists n_1 \ldots n_l x_1 \ldots x_{l'} y_1 \ldots y_{m'} w_1 \ldots w_{l''} z_1 \ldots z_{m''} \psi'''_k$$

Lemma 29. *Let $(G, (k, r))$ be an instance of* WSRE(S) *(resp.* WERE(S)*) where $\emptyset \neq S \subseteq \{\mathsf{v}, \mathsf{e}, \mathsf{a}\}$ with associated incidence structure S_G. There exist first order formulæ ϕ_k, for $k \geq 0$, such that S_G is a model for ϕ_k if and only if $(G, (k, r))$ is a* YES*-instance of* WSRE(S) *(resp.* WERE(S)*).*

By Frick and Grohe's metatheorem [11] and Lemma 29:

Theorem 30. *The problems* WSRE(S) *and* WERE(S) *are fixed-parameter tractable for parameter (k, r) where $\emptyset \neq S \subseteq \{\mathsf{v}, \mathsf{e}, \mathsf{a}\}$.*

7. WDCE and Treewidth

We now return to the WDCE problem with an alternate parameterization, the treewidth $\mathrm{tw}(G)$ of the input graph G. There are several options for parameterizing, dependent on what combination of the treewidth, the degree bound r and the editing cost k is chosen. Of course if both k and r are part of the parameterization, we already have a complete classification in Theorem 1. It can also be observed that if a graph G has treewidth $\mathrm{tw}(G) \leq t$, then there is some vertex $v \in V(G)$ with $d(v) \leq t$. Therefore for $\mathrm{WDCE}_1^r(\mathsf{v}, \mathsf{e})$ if $r > t$ we may immediately answer No. The vertex v with $d(v) \leq t$ must be deleted, however the resultant graph G' has $\mathrm{tw}(G') \leq t$, therefore this process cascades and the entire graph must be deleted. Furthermore if $r \leq t$ and k is also a parameter, then Theorem 1 applies. As $\mathrm{WDCE}^*(S)$ for $\emptyset \neq S \subseteq \{\mathsf{e}, \mathsf{a}\}$ is in P, parameterization by any combination of treewidth, k and r does not affect the complexity.

Samer and Szeider [29] show that the General Factor $=_\infty \mathrm{WDCE}_1(\mathsf{e})$ problem is $\mathsf{W}[1]$-hard when parameterized by treewidth alone. We can extend this to $\mathrm{WDCE}(\mathsf{e})$.

Proposition 31. $\mathrm{WDCE}_1(\mathsf{e})$ *is* $\mathsf{W}[1]$*-hard when parameterized by the treewidth of the input graph. Furthermore it remains* $\mathsf{W}[1]$*-hard when the input graphs are bipartite and the degree constraints of one partite set are limited to* $\{1\}$*.*

Proof. Samer and Szeider's proof [29] establishes the $\mathsf{W}[1]$-hardness of ${}_\infty\mathrm{WDCE}_1(\mathsf{e})$ when restricted to bipartite graphs where the degree constraints of one partite set are $\{1\}$. We simply choose $k = \sum_{uv \in E(G)} \rho(uv)$, where G is the input graph. □

By taking the complement instance, we obtain the result for edge addition. In this case the structure of the graph is not preserved, so we cannot claim additional restrictions on the input.

Corollary 32. $\mathrm{WDCE}_1(\mathsf{a})$ *is* $\mathsf{W}[1]$*-hard when parameterized by the treewidth of the input graph.*

If we set the vertex weights appropriately, we can also allow vertex deletion. However we can no longer claim unit weights.

Corollary 33. $\mathrm{WDCE}(\mathsf{v}, \mathsf{e})$ *is* $\mathsf{W}[1]$*-hard when parameterized by the treewidth of the input graph. Furthermore it remains* $\mathsf{W}[1]$*-hard when the input graphs are bipartite and the degree constraints of one partite set are limited to* $\{1\}$*.*

Proof. For all vertices $v \in V(G)$ set $\rho(v) = k + 1$. Then no vertex can be deleted within the cost. □

Taking the complement instance:

Corollary 34. WDCE(v, a) *is* $\mathsf{W}[1]$*-hard when parameterized by the treewidth of the input graph.*

By subdividing the edges and weighting the original vertices we can restrict the operations to vertex deletion alone.

Corollary 35. WDCE(v) *is* $\mathsf{W}[1]$*-hard when parameterized by the treewidth of the input graph. Furthermore it remains* $\mathsf{W}[1]$*-hard when the input graphs are bipartite and the degree constraints of one partite set are limited to* $\{1\}$*.*

7.1. Parameterizations Excluding k

If we consider version of the problem where the number of edit operations is unbounded, we can obtain some further results for limited cases. In this setting, as the number of deletions is unbounded, we do not consider the trivial case where $V(G) = \emptyset$ as a valid solution.

Lemma 36. ${}_\infty\text{WDCE}_1^r(\mathsf{v})$ *is fixed-parameter tractable when parameterized by the treewidth of the input graph.*

Proof. As noted earlier, if $r > \text{tw}(G)$ for a graph G, then $(G, \text{tw}(G))$ is a No-instance of ${}_\infty\text{WDCE}_1^r(\mathsf{v})$, as the entire graph would have to be deleted. However if $r \leq \text{tw}(G)$, we may apply Courcelle's Theorem with the following second order sentence:

$$\begin{aligned}\exists S \forall v \forall u (Vv \to Sv \vee \exists v_1, \ldots, v_r (\textstyle\bigwedge_{i \neq j \in [r]} (v_i \neq v_j) \wedge \\ \textstyle\bigwedge_{i \in [r]} (\neg S v_i \wedge A v v_i \wedge v \neq v_i) \wedge \\ (Avu \to Su \vee \textstyle\bigvee_{i \in [r]} u = v_i)))\end{aligned}$$

where Axy is shorthand for $\exists e(Ee \wedge Vx \wedge Vy \wedge Ixe \wedge Iye)$ (i.e, x and y are adjacent). The sentence ensures that there is a set S (the deleted vertices) such that for every vertex v and every vertex u, either v is deleted, or it is adjacent to r distinct vertices that haven't been deleted, and if u is adjacent to v, then it is one of these vertices, or it has been deleted. □

This can be extended to include edge deletion.

Lemma 37. ${}_\infty\mathrm{WDCE}_1^r(\mathsf{v},\mathsf{e})$ *is fixed-parameter tractable when parameterized by the treewidth of the input graph.*

Proof. As before if $r > \mathrm{tw}(G)$, the instance is a No-instance. Then we need only construct a second order logic sentence that encodes the problem.

$$\exists S \forall v \forall e (Vv \to Sv \vee (\exists e_1, \ldots, e_r, v_1, \ldots, v_r (\phi_1 \wedge \phi_2)))$$

where ϕ_1 is the conjunction of subclauses (1)–(5):

(1) $\bigwedge_{i\in[r]} \neg Se_i \wedge \neg Sv_i$ "e_i and v_i have not been deleted;"
(2) $\bigwedge_{i\in[r]} Ee_i \wedge Vv_i$ "e_i is an edge and v_i is a vertex;"
(3) $\bigwedge_{i\in[r]} v_i \neq v$ "v is not equal to any v_i;"
(4) $\bigwedge_{i\in[r]} Iv_ie_i \wedge Ive_i$ "v and v_i are adjacent;"
(5) $\bigwedge_{i\neq j\in[r]} v_i \neq v_j$ "the v_is are distinct."

and

$$\phi_2 = Ive \to (\bigvee_{i\in[r]} (e = e_i) \vee Se \vee \exists u (Iue \wedge u \neq v \wedge Su))$$

ϕ_2 ensures that if there is an edge incident to v, then either it is one of the r edges making up the the regular degree of v, it was deleted, or its other endpoint was deleted. □

If vertex deletion and edge addition are allowed, then the problem becomes trivially polynomial.

Lemma 38. ${}_\infty\mathrm{WDCE}_1^r(\mathsf{v},\mathsf{e},\mathsf{a})$ *and* ${}_\infty\mathrm{WDCE}_1^r(\mathsf{v},\mathsf{a})$ *are polynomial-time solvable.*

Proof. As the number of edit operations is unlimited, we can simply delete all but $r+1$ vertices, and make the graph a K_{r+1}.

If there are less than $r+1$, it is not possible to have an r-regular graph, and we answer No immediately. □

8. Conclusion

We have examined a series of editing problems with constraints based on natural extensions of regularity. As with the WDCE series of problems, problems with extended edge-degree based constraints are in FPT with combined parameter $k+r$, but W[1]-hard with parameter k and para-NP-complete

with paramter r. There are a number of avenues of further research open with these problems, the mostprominent being the development of a concrete algorithm for WSRE($\mathsf{v}, \mathsf{e}, \mathsf{a}$). The techniques of [15] may be applicable, however this is certainly not trivial.

We also consider parameterizations of variants of the WDCE problem by the treewidth of the input graph and demonstrate tractability for these problems.

References

[1] Rémy Belmonte, Petr A. Golovach, Pim van 't Hof, and Daniël Paulusma. Parameterized complexity of three edge contraction problems with degree constraints. *Acta Informatica*, 51(7):473–497, 2014.

[2] H. Bodlaender, R. Tan, and J. van Leeuwen. Finding a $\triangle$-regular supergraph of minimum order. *Discr. Appl. Math.*, 131(1):3–9, 2003.

[3] Hans L. Bodlaender, Rodney G. Downey, Michael R. Fellows, and Danny Hermelin. On problems without polynomial kernels (extended abstract). In Luca Aceto, Ivan Damgård, Leslie Ann Goldberg, Magnús M. Halldórsson, Anna Ingólfsdóttir, and Igor Walukiewicz, editors, *35th International Colloquium on Automata, Languages and Programming (ICALP'08) Part I: Tack A: Algorithms, Automata, Complexity, and Games (Extended Abstract)*, volume 5125 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 563–574. Springer, 2008.

[4] Domingos M. Cardoso, Marcin Kamiński, and Vadim Lozin. Maximum k-regular induced subgraphs. *J. Comb. Optim.*, 14(4):455–463, 2007.

[5] F. Cheah and D. G. Corneil. The complexity of regular subgraph recognition. *Discr. Appl. Math.*, 27(1–2):59–68, 1990.

[6] G. Cornuéjols. General factors of graphs. *J. Combin. Theory Ser. B*, 45(2):185–198, 1988.

[7] Konrad K. Dabrowski, Petr A. Golovach, Pim van 't Hof, Daniël Paulusma, and Dimitrios M. Thilikos. Editing to a planar graph of given degrees. In *CSR*, 2015.

[8] J. Edmonds. Maximum matching and a polyhedron with 0,1-vertices. *Journal of Research of the National Bureau of Standards*, 69B:125–130, 1965.

[9] J. Edmonds. Paths trees and flowers. *Canadian J. Math.*, 17:449–467, 1965.

[10] Michael R. Fellows, Jiong Guo, Hannes Moser, and Rolf Niedermeier. A generalization of nemhauser and trotter's local optimization theorem. In Susanne Albers and Jean-Yves Marion, editors, *26th International Symposium on Theoretical Aspects of Computer Science (STACS'09)*, pages 409–420, 2009.

[11] M. Frick and M. Grohe. Deciding first-order properties of locally tree-decomposable structures. *J. ACM*, 48(6):1184–1206, 2001.

[12] Vincent Froese, André Nichterlein, and Rolf Niedermeier. Win-win kernelization for degree sequence completion problems. In *Proceedings of the Scandinavian Symposium and Workshops on Algorithm Theory (SWAT'14)*, Lectures Notes in Computer Science. Springer, 2014.

[13] M. R. Garey and D. S. Johnson. *Computers and Intractability: A Guide to the Theory of NP-Completeness*. W. H. Freeman and Company, New York, 1979.

[14] Petr A. Golovach. Editing to a connected graph of given degrees. In *Proceedings of the Conference on the Mathematical Foundations of Computer Science (MFCS'14)*, volume 8635 of *Lectures Notes in Computer Science*, pages 324–335. Springer, 2014.

[15] Petr A. Golovach. Editing to a graph of given degrees. *Theor. Comput. Sci.*, 591:72–84, 2015.

[16] Pavol Hell and David G. Kirkpatrick. On the completeness of a generalized matching problem. In *Conference Record of the Tenth Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing (STOC'78)*, pages 240–245, 1978.

[17] Bernhard Korte and Jens Vygen. *Combinatorial Optimization*, volume 21 of *Algorithms and Combinatorics*. Springer, Berlin, fourth edition, 2008.

[18] Harold W. Kuhn. The Hungarian method for the assignment problem. *Naval Research Logistics Quarterly*, 2(2):83–97, 1955.

[19] Harold W. Kuhn. Variants of the Hungarian method for assignment problems. *Naval Research Logistics Quarterly*, 3(4):253–258, 1956.

[20] L. Lovász. The factorization of graphs. In *Combinatorial Structures and their Applications (Proc. Calgary Internat. Conf., Calgary, Alta., 1969)*, pages 243–246. Gordon and Breach, New York, 1970.

[21] L. Lovász. The factorization of graphs. II. *Acta Math. Acad. Sci. Hungar.*, 23:223–246, 1972.

[22] Luke Mathieson. *The Parameterized Complexity of Degree Constrained Editing Problems*. PhD thesis, University of Durham, 2010.

[23] Luke Mathieson and Stefan Szeider. Editing graphs to satisfy degree constraits: A parameterized approach. *J. of Computer and System Sciences*, 78:179–191, 2012.

[24] Hans Moser and Dimitrios Thilikos. Parameterized complexity of finding regular induced subgraphs. *J. Discrete Algorithms*, 2008. Article in Press.

[25] G. L. Nemhauser and L. E. Trotter Jr. Vertex packings: Structural properties and algorithms. *Mathematical Programming*, 8:232–248, 1975.

[26] Christos H. Papadimitriou. *Computational Complexity*. Addison Wesley, 1994.

[27] J. Plesník. A note on the complexity of finding regular subgraphs. *Discrete Math.*, 49(2):161–167, 1984.

[28] Elena Prieto and Christian Sloper. Looking at the stars. *Theoret. Comput. Sci.*, 351(3):437–445, 2006.

[29] Marko Samer and Stefan Szeider. Tractable cases of the extended global cardinality constraint. In *Computing: The Australasian Theory Symposium (CATS'08)*, volume 77 of *CRPIT*, pages 67–74. ACS, 2008.

[30] Iain A. Stewart. Deciding whether a planar graph has a cubic subgraph is NP-complete. *Discrete Math.*, 126(1–3):349–357, 1994.

[31] Iain A. Stewart. Finding regular subgraphs in both arbitrary and planar graphs. *Discr. Appl. Math.*, 68(3):223–235, 1996.

[32] Iain A. Stewart. On locating cubic subgraphs in bounded-degree connected bipartite graphs. *Discrete Math.*, 163(1–3):319–324, 1997.

[33] Larry J. Stockmeyer. The polynomial-time hierarchy. *Theoret. Comput. Sci.*, 3(1):1–22, 1976.

[34] W. T. Tutte. A short proof of the factor theorem for finite graphs. *Canadian J. Math.*, 6:347–352, 1954.

[35] W. T. Tutte. Spanning subgraphs with specified valencies. *Discrete Math.*, 9(1):97–108, 1974.

[36] R. J. Urquhart. *Degree Constrained Subgraphs of Linear Graphs*. PhD thesis, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, USA, 1967.